



ORAL HISTORY—

JOHN G. KEANE

This is an interview conducted on December 28, 1988, with former Census Bureau Director John G. Keane [March 1984-January 1989]. The interviewers were David M. Pemberton, Census History Staff, and Frederick G. Bohme, then Chief of the Bureau's History Staff.

Pemberton: This is December 28, 1988. We are interviewing Dr. John G. Keane, Director of the Bureau of the Census.

Keane: I was born on July 3, 1930 and raised in Fort Wayne, Indiana. I pretty much stayed there until I departed for college—the University of Notre Dame in September 1948—and was there until January 1951. This was, of course, at about the time of the Korean War, and there was quite an exodus on college campuses. *Life Magazine* wrote about the exodus in the early part of 1951. I joined the Air Force rather than be drafted; so I left college. After basic training at Lackland Air Force Base, in San Antonio, Texas, the Air Force said, “We have two choices for you—cooks’ and bakers’ school or the Russian language program.” I thought I’d like to try for the Russian language program.

The first thing they did was put us through 2 weeks of English and then 6 weeks of preliminary Russian in San Antonio; after that, I was sent to Syracuse University. While at Syracuse, I studied on the side and, therefore, transferred my Notre Dame credits of 2 1/2 years, the year studying Russian, and extra credits. I obtained an A.B. degree in Russian Studies. I then went back to Texas and undertook intelligence work, and also went to Trinity University. Next, I was shipped to Japan around May of 1953 and went to Sophia University, a Jesuit school, at night. After I completed my stay at Sophia University, I came back to the United States in late 1954, and left the Armed Services on January 7, 1955.

I transferred my credits from Trinity and Sophia back to Notre Dame and took a heavy load of 18 or 19 hours that semester. I also took 8 hours that summer and graduated in August of 1955. I immediately enrolled in Indiana University. I talked the university into allowing me to take a heavy load of classes there, subsequently earning a M.B.A. degree in 9 months. I started to work soon thereafter. After a false start at a company in Birmingham, Michigan, [the] Barry Door Corporation, I went to work for US Steel [in Pittsburgh, PA]. While there, I started the doctoral program at the University of Pittsburgh at night—you could do that then. This was 1956. I met my wife who worked for the commercial department at US Steel; we married in 1959. I went to Chicago to work for Booz, Allen & Hamilton in 1960. Then decided to do advertising work at Needham, Harper, and Steers, and other agencies through 1972. In 1965, I did get my doctorate, tendered my dissertation, and so forth from Pittsburgh. It's not easy to do—raising a family, holding a full time job, and getting a doctor's degree. I consider it as big an achievement as I've ever managed. Nine years of doing that.

Bohme: **Did you happen to use your Russian at any time before you came in contact with the [Russian] officials through the Census Bureau?**

Keane: No, unlike the Romance languages, you just don't run into it. Although it's much more prevalent than it was, it has kind of died back. Russian was available in a lot of high schools and even a few grade schools. Now it seems to be falling back. I just had lunch with Bill Watts, a member of the class, at the Cosmos Club. (He reported directly to Henry Kissinger at one point; Al Haig was his assistant). Bill Watts went back and got a master's degree from Harvard in Russian Studies and was posted at the United States Embassy in Moscow. Now there's a fellow who used his Russian Studies degree well. We had a reunion in March 1986 in Alexandria, Virginia. Some of our classmates really got a chance to go "whooping up" the war stories.

I wanted to get in charge of my professional life, so I founded Managing Change, Inc. in 1972. The company essentially was devoted to future studies, strategic planning, and marketing planning. A lot of work in marketing; I'd been long involved in the American Marketing Association (AMA) chapter levels, board, and held the office of president-elect, president, national board. I was president of the AMA, an association of about 45,000 members, from 1976-1977. That becomes relevant to the Census Bureau because it has an AMA Advisory committee made up of members from the American Marketing Association. I was put on that

committee in 1979 and became its chairperson 1982 or 1983. That later helped in my coming to the Census Bureau as Director.

Pemberton: Did you know much about [your predecessors and] the process of your becoming Director of the Bureau of the Census?

Keane: Not a whole lot. I knew all the “recent” past directors with the exception of Dick Scammon [Richard M. Scammon, Director, Bureau of the Census, 1961-1965]. I knew some of the past Deputy Directors: Louis [C. Louis Kincannon, Deputy Director, Bureau of the Census, 1982-1993], Bob Hagan [Robert L. Hagan, Deputy Director, Bureau of the Census, 1972-1979], and Danny Levine [Daniel L. Levine, Deputy Director, Bureau of the Census, 1979-1982]. Barabba [Vincent P. Barabba, Director, Bureau of the Census, 1973-1976 and 1979-1981], and Bruce Chapman [Bruce K. Chapman, Director, Bureau of the Census, 1981-1983], were an influence on my being selected for the position of Director. I’m not sure; Al Tella [Senior Advisor to the Director, Bureau of the Census, 1973-1986] once told me that Bruce Chapman asked Al to put a list together. Then Bruce, who had designs on other things when he knew he was going to leave, or maybe he wanted to make it easier to leave, I am not sure, by having someone earmarked. You’ll have to ask Bruce about that. But anyway, Al showed me a list (you might want to talk to Al about this) that he put together of people who were on the Bureau’s advisory committees. Al said I was one of the names that he put on the list. Al was, at that point, the liaison to the American Marketing Association Advisory Committee. Maybe it wasn’t justified, but I had the feeling that I’d been tapped. I saw Sid Jones [Sidney L. Jones, Under Secretary of Commerce for Economic Affairs, 1981-1986], Secretary Baldrige [Malcolm A. Baldrige, Secretary of Commerce, 1981-1987], and Ed Meese [Edwin Meese, III, Counselor to President Reagan, 1981-1985], at the time when Deaver [Michael K. Deaver, Deputy Chief of Staff to the President, and Special Assistant to the President, 1981-1985], Meese, and Baker [James A. Baker, III, Chief of Staff to the President, 1981-1985] met every Thursday on presidential appointees. Then, they made their recommendation to President Reagan. But I think Bruce had greased the skids. I don’t know that for a fact, but I, on the other hand, feel that was the case.

Pemberton: Anything memorable about the interview?

Keane: About which interview?

Pemberton: The interview with Meese.

Keane: No. Bruce Chapman was there; he was in on it. It was not a penetrating interview, which leads me to one of the reasons I've concluded as I have. It was a cordial interview. I had the impression that perhaps he just wanted to satisfy himself that I would not be an embarrassment to the Administration and the President. Apparently, they became assured of that. Of course, I had some credentials—I had been an advisor to the Census Bureau; I had used Census data; and I just wasn't controversial, as my hearing would reflect. I think the interview lasted approximately 12 minutes.

Pemberton: What did you find when you got to the Census Bureau in 1984?

Keane: Remember, I had gone to Saudi Arabia for the Census Bureau in late October 1983. If I missed that meeting, it would have been 3 years, approximately, before another meeting. So I went over in late 1983. Do you have a copy of my calendar? That should be on it. You have several dates, you have government service dates, one of which is December 16; another is December 12. I was sworn in by Supreme Court Justice Sandra Day O'Connor on the 20th, but it also was done by someone at the Census Bureau on the 18th. It may have been a little more complicated than some of the others.

Pemberton: When you got here, to the Census Bureau, what did you find or feel, with regard to your priorities for the agency, and what problems or challenges did you find of the highest importance?

Keane: I did not find a troubled agency. I found an agency that had come out of some trouble—the RIF [reduction in force] about 1982, and the healing stage in 1983. I heard some of the criticism about the delay of the reports of the census. There were some others, including the agricultural census. I didn't feel like a lamb for the slaughter. I didn't feel like the agency was in trouble in Congress. I didn't feel in trouble anywhere.

I did want to continue the work which Barabba started, particularly on marketing the agency, and build a lot on that. I did want to start strategic planning. That was one of the four aspirations, early on. I thought that the awareness of the place is way, way understated, and still is. I go out like I came in—feeling that, although we have made a lot of improvements, it depends on what's the benchmark. If the benchmark is again “as it was,” there have been a lot of improvements. If the benchmark is “as it could be, or should be,” the agency has a long way to go.

I was amazed at the things that aren't told an advisor (i.e., a member of a Census Bureau advisory committee). Not by design—they just aren't told. For instance, the international involvement, which has been why we've had some of the presentations at the meetings of the advisory committees. Bob Bartram [Robert O. Bartram, Assistant Director for International Programs, Bureau of the Census, 1982-1987] came before that group several years ago to talk about that. I knew that they would be pleasantly surprised by our involvement. I felt at the time that there was an overwhelming amount of attention paid to the decennial census at the expense of other programs. I tried (not at the expense of the decennial census program) to bring those other programs up. That's why the Advertising Council advertised the economic censuses and the agricultural census for the first time this last round [i.e., 1987]. All the other times the Advertising Council's effort had been exclusively devoted to the decennial census of population and housing; there are some people on the executive staff that wanted that to continue, including Chuck Waite [Charles A. Waite, Associate Director for Economic Programs, Bureau of the Census, 1983-1994].

Pemberton: **Is there any measure of the extent of the success of the advertising for the 1987 Economic Censuses?**

Keane: They feel pretty good about it. I like the work that was done. If you say, "Well, the proof's in the pudding, what about the response rates?" They were pretty good, too. We thought we might see some deterioration in those; however, compared to previous economic and agriculture censuses, the response rates over a time period are pretty close. I think that's a plus, because in my judgement (with only the anecdotal evidence) I say the climate for conducting surveys and censuses in the country has deteriorated. Therefore, if you can meet the response targets and all within the same time period, roughly, on the economic and agricultural censuses, then we've overcome that deterioration to maintain the past, and it bodes well for 1990.

Pemberton: **Will the same advertising agency that handled the 1987 Economic Censuses handle the 1990 Census of Population and Housing.**

Keane: Yes, Ogilvy & Mather.

Pemberton: **Do you have a view of a Director's duties and responsibilities?**

Keane: A view of Director's duties and responsibilities: Well, here's one. I went into Louis Kincannon's office early in 1984 and said, "Why don't I just take 6 months to try and get used to the agency?" And what did he say? Well, he said something like,

“Why don’t you take about 6 days?” Either that, or he said, “You’ve got a hearing coming up.” Or something like that. I recall that he disabused me of that real fast.

Pemberton: Were there any urgent priorities upon your arrival?

Keane: I don’t recall any. We weren’t in damage control; we weren’t being stressed; we were coming back from a stress [RIF in 1982].

Pemberton: One of the first things you set up when you came in was the strategic task force, which put out its first report a couple of years ago, and its second report, just. . .

Keane: This past June.

Pemberton: How did you choose the people to be in the strategic planning function process, and what kind of guidance did you give to keep it going?

Keane: We started with the executive staff. There was a problem here because the executive staff was so large. With its size, it went at least one extra layer in the organizational chart, and that’s why they had all the leaks out of there. Nothing could be discussed of any consequence, without it getting out into the agency. So we cut its size to seven people; the position of associate director of the decennial census had not been created. That cleaned the size issue up. There were probably some ruffled feathers and bruised egos along the way.

So we started with seven people right in the strategic planning committee; that was essentially done in the first few meetings—on picking others, deciding how many, and who. Those individuals were not picked by me. I would write the criteria, and we would argue about those. We would finally agree on those, and then we would look for balance. We just couldn’t have people only from the demographic or economic areas; you just couldn’t have all men and no women, etc. There were some funny aspects of that too. Sometimes a name would surface in one meeting; the participants would say, “No, no, we don’t want so and so.” In another meeting, the same name would come up again. The meetings were humorous, at the time—the little strategies and the byplay. They’re still humorous in recalling them.

But that was the first thing to do, set [up] the committee, which was composed of seven individuals, plus Steve Tupper [Steve R. Tupper, Assistant Director for Communications, Bureau of the Census, 1983-1984]. You realize that you really need a Congressional contact. Steve Tupper was ours at DUSD [Data User

Services Division], Congressional Affairs, and PIO [the Public Information Office]. You needed Sherry Courtland [Sherry L. Courtland, Chief, Program and Policy Development Office, Bureau of the Census, 1980-1990] because she's inclined not to be the first to speak. Ted Clemence [Theodore H. Clemence, Senior Advisor to the Deputy Director, Bureau of the Census, 1980-1989] would speak up quickly all the time. Often Pete [Peter A. Bounpane, Assistant Director for Demographic Censuses, Bureau of the Census, 1981-1987] would, but you needed someone who would kind of be different in temperament. We gave that thought after a little speech of mine about needing thoughtful people, creative people. We needed people who pop off with any idea; we needed others who were very analytical. Therefore, we chose Ted Clemence (for his sense of history), Pete Bounpane (top person on the decennial census), Sherry Courtland, and Roger Bugenhagen [Roger H. Bugenhagen, Assistant Director for Economic and Agriculture Censuses, Bureau of the Census, 1986-1993]. A good argument could and was made for each one of them. When Charlie Jones [Charles D. Jones, Associate Director for Decennial Censuses, Bureau of the Census, 1987-1994] joined, the committee increased in size. When five members left, only four were replaced. One more doesn't sound like much but it does add to it. That's why the number of members was established as it was.

I can be heavy handed in the meetings. I will do anything, whether it is humor, outrageous behavior, be argumentative. If I thought something was sensitive or there was disagreement, I would say, "Oh! You all think you agree on what quality is. Everybody write down your definition of quality and pass it up here." I'd shuffle them and read the definitions, which didn't get anyone into trouble. After a while though, I could begin to guess who was writing what. That's the way those sessions went. It took 4 or 5 months and, six, seven, eight meetings before I think they realized I could identify them by the writing. Emerson Elliott [Emerson J. Elliott, Acting Commissioner, Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education], Butz [William P. Butz, Associate Director for Demographic Programs, Bureau of the Census, 1982-1995] and two others from the Department of Education's statistics department discussed the way I ran these meetings after the first meeting had been held. I asked him the question, "When did all of you feel you were getting something out of this?" (You should ask some of them that, alone, when they were getting something out of that.) They put a lot of faith in me, a lot of trust.

Pemberton: Did you generally chair those meetings?

Keane: Oh, all the time, the first 30, except for this one in December that C. Louis Kincannon chaired. I was there for all of them. Once I left at 9:45 in the morning when Louis pulled me out and said my father had died. But with the exception of that, I chaired all of them.

Pemberton: In your writing, one of the things you have mentioned is that it is occasionally difficult to sell senior management on the need for long-range strategic planning. Did you have difficulties selling the concept?

Keane: No, they seemed to be ready. The more relevant question perhaps is, why were they ready? I don't know. Barbara Bailar [Barbara A. Bailar, Associate Director for Statistical Standards and Methodology, Bureau of the Census, 1979-1989], said one night at dinner, "We're ready for this, Jack." This is a careful agency; this is an agency that is methodological in its orientation. It doesn't fly off the handle. You see this reported in Pear's [Robert Pear, Chief of the Washington Bureau of the *New York Times*] column in the *New York Times* this morning [December 28, 1988], where he's quite complimentary, and he's a tough critic. I think they sense that we really don't have any long-range plans for the agency. You certainly don't get any help on the side. You don't get help from OMB [Office of Management and Budget]. The Commerce Department thinks long-range planning is the MBO [management by objective] system; well, that is better than not having it. But then the travesty is that before we were called in, they would delay us usually 15 or 20 minutes while they briefed Bud Brown [Clarence L. Brown, Deputy Secretary of Commerce, 1983-1988]. We didn't operate that way at all. We put a lot of work in, but not so much that it ever took from the other programs, and we didn't step on the toes of the other programs. We offered an umbrella for the other programs. We were careful not to step on the toes of automation; we didn't step on the toes of affirmative action; we didn't step on the toes of the MBO system. We almost stepped on the toes of the decennial census one time, but Charlie Jones said in a meeting, "Hey, wait a minute, this is really too close to home," and we backed off and let it alone. That was the right thing to do in my judgment. That's one of the reasons long-range strategic planning has been accepted; it gives a framework. It gives a structure with which to decide those other programs. They complement each other rather than compete with each other. That is, in my judgment, an important point.

Pemberton: You say you felt the Bureau or the officials on the strategic planning committee were ready for it. You also suggested we should ask them why they were ready for it. Do you have any feeling about it?

Keane: Not beyond just what I said. We're a careful agency, and we like structure. We like to know where we're going, and [we're] uncomfortable with uncertainty. Not that strategic planning [is a] certainty. It is not. But it is a disciplined approach; it does rely on analysis. Those are hallmarks of the *modus operandi* of the Census Bureau.

Pemberton: Was the Department of Commerce receptive to this notion?

Keane: I haven't gotten much of a "blip," yea or nea, out of main Commerce on this whole thing. About 1 week after the October 3, 1985 presentation to the division chiefs on the first strategic plan, Bud Brown with Andy Cochrane [Andrew R. Cochrane, Office of the Inspector General, Department of Commerce] and Mark Policinski [Mark R. Policinski, Associate Deputy Secretary of Commerce, 1985-1987], devoted 1 hour to it, and that was the most receptive response I've gotten. I think it is indicative that Bud did say that Secretary Baldrige had seen it on his desk and was looking at it, but I never did hear from him. Bruce Merrifield [D. Bruce Merrifield, Assistant Secretary for Productivity, Technology, and Innovation, Department of Commerce, 1981-1989] has read it; but he's an analytical individual, but I don't think it makes that much difference. Sadly, I don't think many have read it at all.

Pemberton: You may want to come back to strategic planning at some point in the future, but to move along. When you arrived, I believe there were five associate directors, a deputy director, plus you, amounting to seven members on the committee. There have been some reorganizations since then, the most recent one being (at least major one) the creation of a sixth associate director for the decennial census. Do you have any statement as to why it was important to set up an associate directorship for the decennial census and any of the other significant reorganizations of the Bureau that have taken place while your were director?

Keane: My most significant observation was—Why hadn't it been done long before it was? Given the scope, size, proportion of resources commanded, and importance of the decennial census, why was it just in demographic programs rather than its own directorate? That's my biggest surprise. So, in my judgment it was long overdue.

My second observation is that it got mired in events because we could not get the reorganization approved. Ortner [Robert Ortner, Under Secretary of Commerce for Economic Affairs, 1986-1989] would not move, and there was some delay in

Administration, too, in the Department of Commerce. But Ortner would not move; he had nothing against the reorganization, it was just his statement about what was happening to him. Senator Kasten [Senator Robert W. Kasten, Jr., (R., Wisconsin)] was holding up Ortner's Senate confirmation as under secretary because he wanted a million-dollar grant from the Economic Development Agency [EDA] to improve either Racine's harbor, or Kenosha's harbor in Wisconsin. He, in turn, apparently had gotten himself on the hook with the governor of Wisconsin—I believe of a different party—and said he could deliver this, but he couldn't. Orson Swindle [Orson G. Swindle, Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Economic Development, Department of Commerce, 1985-1989] at the EDA (Economic Development Administration) thought this was a boondoggle, and wouldn't approve it. Ortner could have left Bruce Merrifield as acting under secretary. Instead he chose to do nothing as a response. So what happens to all those people connected with the decennial census? Should they go to Bill Butz as they were or should they go to Charlie Jones, who was identified, but not approved? This went on for the better part of the year. That was just a terrible thing for the agency. That's day after day, whom do we send the memo to? Whom do we ask the decision from? Those are the things you hope you don't find in Government, but you do. Not that they don't go on in the private sector, but that's inconceivable. That just wouldn't be tolerated. I can't imagine myself doing that. I would have had the deputy director approve it and move on with it. Why in the world would he hold a grudge over something like this?

Pemberton: There was a earlier reorganization. You mentioned that Data User Services, the Public Information Office, and Congressional Relations were under an assistant director, I believe, who—ultimately that job was abolished and the divisions were divided up.

Keane: Was Tupper assistant director? Yeah, I guess he was. Okay.

Pemberton: Any feeling about that one or . . . ?

Keane: Well, those are three pretty important activities, and three pretty big ones. They got about 150 or so people working in the Data User Services Division.

Pemberton: One hundred twenty.

Keane: One hundred twenty now. Congressional Affairs is getting larger and larger. There's a pretty good size group in the Public Information Office. So, that had been put together pretty much by Bruce Chapman. Bruce had designed a job for his friend, Steve Tupper. They had been together in the State of Washington

government and Seattle's government, so he put those three Census Bureau "units" together. When Bruce was gone, Louis [Kincannon] and myself felt free to reexamine it. Louis could speak for himself, but my recollection is that we both agreed we'd like to see more of a marketing push. Data User Services and Roland Moore [Roland H. Moore, Associate Director for Field Operations, Bureau of the Census, 1983-1991] are as good a group of marketers as we have here. Roland Moore does not have an MBA in marketing, but if you define marketing broadly as putting forth the agency in inventive, appealing, consistent ways, we wondered what it would do under him. We were talking about marketing before, maybe it was with Neil. You ought to get Neil Tillman [Walter Neil Tillman, Editor, *Census and You*, Data User Services Division, Bureau of the Census], because on two occasions he taped about 3 hours with me. So you ought to use each other's tapes. When I was talking about the lack of coordinating a marketing strategy, I feel badly about it, and I don't know quite how to solve it. It goes on to so many different areas. Anyway, we put Data User Services Division under Roland Moore and then we had the Public Information Office and the Congressional Affairs Office report directly to us. The span of control wasn't that onerous here that we couldn't do that. I felt strongly about improving awareness.

Well that has a lot to do with, of course, Congressional Affairs. At that point, we were already talking about several strategic programs that involved at least one of improving congressional awareness.

Pemberton: Has the issues of awareness initiative been sort of a front-burner, on-going operation?

Keane: I think it's suffered because of personnel changes. We had gotten Sarah-Kathryn McDonald to start out—so she caught on fast, but didn't know anything about that until I introduced her to the founder of the Issues Management Association, and to others. But she caught on about the time she moved on to the London School of Business and Economics, so we had to start over. It's been so dormant; I don't know where the activity stands. I ran a session about 18 months ago, maybe not quite that long ago. I haven't heard that much of it. It does tie in though. There certainly is a linkage to strategic planning.

Pemberton: Yes, one of the key functions of the Director of the Bureau of the Census is "to represent the agency to a variety of groups of people outside the agency— foreign governments; other government agencies, be they Federal, state, or local; professional associations; trade associations; etc." We have a sort of long listing in this outline

of the job of Census emissary. Do you have any comments you would like to make about it? I have a list of four countries, which to me seem to be of particular importance with regard to the United States foreign policy these days. China and the Soviet Union, both of which we are now making significant approaches toward and have been for some years. Canada and Mexico—our two neighbors. We have a variety of initiatives with both, particularly with Canada, on import and export statistics. Do you have any feelings, conclusions, or observations you would like to offer on your role in meeting your counterparts from these countries or others?

Keane: Bob Bartram, Bruce Chapman, and I went to China in July of 1984. Particularly Bob and I were at more meetings than Bruce. We negotiated a protocol there which still holds. The Bureau of Labor Statistics has used it [too], since it is a lot easier, I understand, to use someone else's rather than develop your own. That's been a good relationship. A lot of people from here have been at the Bureau of Labor Statistics, and a number of them have been at the Bureau of the Census. I am talking beyond just our international training in ISPC [International Statistical Programs Center]. I'm talking about workshops and so forth. That has been quite successful.

Starting with the 1987 Annual Research Conference, the Soviet Union, sent three people here and invited us to send three there. It gets to be important with the Soviet Union because once they landed at Kennedy [International Airport, New York, NY], we pick up their expenses. The same thing goes once we reach Passport Control at Moscow airport. The Soviet Union picks up everything until we leave. So you have to have the same numbers traveling as the Soviet Union. I took number one and two from the Soviet Branch, Barry Kostinsky [Barry Kostinsky, Chief, Soviet Branch, Center for International Research, Bureau of the Census] and Matt Sagers [Matthew Sagers, Economist, Soviet Branch, Center for International Research, Bureau of the Census] to Moscow in 1987. In Moscow, we got sort of the "cordial but general treatment" until an 11 a.m. meeting on the 16th that I had with Korolev [Mikhail Korolev, Chairman, Goskomstat (principal Soviet statistical agency), USSR]. Korolev is my counterpart, but he is really much higher. (I have heard for instance, from Mike Palmer, our ambassador to Hungary now, and who was in the embassy for 6 years in the Soviet Union, that Korolev could be among the top 200 of the Soviet Union). Anyway, at that meeting I said, "We are getting a lot of published stuff or a lot of generality, particularly by Pogosov (Igor Pogosov, Deputy Chairman, Goskomstat, USSR), and

others.” And I said—these are the words I used; they didn’t know what I was doing—I could see Matt and Barry [laughter] wondering. They were sitting there to my left; Korolev straight out. He understands English, but it was being translated because of the others, not because of Korolev. I said, “I’ll have my dog lick your hand, we’ll play bridge, we’ll play tennis, anything, but if you want cooperation, that’s a different matter. It can’t be ‘we’ll give you 100 things and you give us one.’ You can’t give us pap. They have heard it all before, or they know it isn’t true. We have a lot of successful relationships around the world. Here’s what makes them successful: We try *quid pro quo* on the exchanges. Candor. We go beyond the published and the obvious to talk about methods. We want to know about your economy and you want to know about our economy.”

We had that frank talk for about 40 minutes. Without an interpreter, he and I went outside for a picture in front of the name plate in the front of the building. I was even franker with him there, when nobody was around. Then there were meetings in the afternoon with some of the specialists. Barry and Matt said that there was a more open tone to those meetings. Pogosev has faded from the scene. Pogosev is younger than I am, but he has been on the scene for a long time and was even jailed by Stalin. Zelenko (Vladimir Zelenko, Staff, International Statistical Cooperation Division, Goskomstat), who was the one who shepherded us around, told me at the Leningrad airport, just before I took off for Helsinki, that “Pogosev was not a well person.” Part of this was an excuse, but it was significant that Pogosev led the delegation here—the three people that came in 1987 to our research conference—and then he just faded from the scene.

In 1988 the Soviet Union sent five to the Annual Research Conference. In turn, Louis [Kincannon] took four people back with him to the Soviet union. He took Matt Sagers and Barry Kostinsky since they were the top two of the Soviet Branch. He took Barbara Torrey [Barbara Boyle Torrey, Chief, Center for International Research, Bureau of the Census, 1986-1992] who would have given her eyeteeth to get there, and should have been there. Finally, Louis took Chuck Waite. Chuck Waite went over very big with the delegation here. They liked him, beyond being very interested in his economic expertise. I promised them here, before they ever left, that we would send him to the USSR in October or whenever. We hadn’t set the time yet. So, that was the group.

I then saw Korolev in Rome, after he had met with our delegation but before I had a chance to talk with anybody in the delegation. It was interesting. He’d come to

the International Statistical Institute, which had formed a subgroup of government statisticians to [go to] the first meeting in Rome. He and I had two sessions there, and I asked him how it went. He said, “Well.” And that was confirmed by C. Louis Kincannon and others when I got back to the Census Bureau.

So, this *glasnost* is for real, in my judgment. Gorbachev [Mikhail S. Gorbachev, President of the Soviet Union and First Secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, 1985-1991] needs honest numbers. He can’t make policy unless he knows what the situation is. There are two powerful groups within the Soviet system; that’s a system we studied 30 years ago in our Russian studies. There is the group that administers the state’s 5-year plan. To the extent that plan isn’t met, they have some face-saving to do. The second group that might be interested in bogus numbers are those industries not making the plan...they can, they do have sanctions, “What are these sanctions?”

He said, “We can have their job records shown. We can deny them promotions. We can fire them.”

Bearing in mind that in a Communist state, a socialist state economy, one of the pillars is a commitment to full employment, I asked, “You can fire them, let someone go?” For him to respond, “Yes, I can fire somebody for doing this” it represented a monumental break-through. This is a change confirmed when we see or hear, for instance, contested offices or criticism of the government. We saw it in the Armenian earthquake. The Soviets are admitting that they’re not well organized. And believe me, you don’t have to go back very far to make the comparison to know what changes these are.

Pemberton: Was the conference in 1987 an invitation from the Census Bureau to its Russian counterparts or a request?

Keane: You would have to clarify that with Robert Bartram, but as I understand it, [it] was an invitation from us. Now Bartram has been on the scene a long time, and the [protocol] with China that we signed in 1984 really started in Buenos Aires in 1979, when Bob Bartram met with the then head of the State Statistical Bureau in China. Bartram is well known among the Asian governments. He can talk to the People’s Republic of China’s head, then turn right around and meet the head of Taiwan. The People’s Republic of China will accept that from him. They accepted it from me, but he is that well known. Over the years, China just know him and they know our training program. Our training program is well known and they know we have good things to offer them.

Pemberton: Are there people from the People's Republic of China and/or the Soviet Union in our training program?

Keane: There are some people from the People's Republic of China. No Europeans at this time. Our training program has representatives from Asia, Latin America, and African countries. You don't find any Europeans, but they're some noises being made about inviting European and Middle Eastern representatives. Of course, you have Saudi Arabia, so that wouldn't be a first. I guess it would be Middle Eastern countries that aren't African.

On the topic of Russia, they have some interesting computer facilities. There are 10 mainframes in their computer center, which I think is essentially the largest computer center outside of the military. They had two others in a census bureau building, bringing the total to 12 mainframes. The Census Bureau has, I believe, four mainframes now and we are "geared" for the 1990 census. The Russians describe their computer as essentially third generation and, with a glint in their eye, said it would be fifth generation "if you could sell us IBM."

We had given them our test census questionnaire when they were over here in 1987. They went to the Annual Research Conference for 3 days, and then came here for 3 days. They may go to the Bureau of Labor Statistics. When they were here, we gave them the questionnaire. When I was in the Soviet Union, they only had two test censuses before their census on January 12, 1989. I asked to see the test census questionnaire and a female official, I can't think of her name, denied my request. Now remember that she was the head of the union. That meant that she had to be high up in the Communist Party. You have to know that, to know how significant this event was. Bushev (Stanislav Bushev, Chief, Main Computer Center, Goskomstat) overruled her on the spot and took the questionnaire. "No, no, I had it in my hand" he said. "You may have it." Because I had protested saying, "We gave you ours. We're talking about cooperation here." But I did not have to make a strident argument about it; he just overruled on that. Furthermore, to my knowledge, we may have been the first people from the West to be permitted in that computer center. I think it a rather extraordinary admission.

Pemberton: Have you made any arrangements to share any statistical data from their census and our census?

Keane: We comment on each other's data and inquire about them. We share everything that's available; they publish the information, and they're having press conferences. They said they had held three or four press conferences already and were having

others. The mainframe system, they told us this last time, has data on approximately 220,000 people. They have one system, without the help of firms like Claritas, in Rosslyn. At the top, you have the 15 regions, like Soviet Georgia. Then at the bottom of the pyramid are 3,000 small offices. The small offices are pressured to recover more and more of their budget by selling computer services. That is the system containing information on 220,000 people. When I asked the head of the delegation this last time, “220,000 people?” He said, “Yeah!”

Then we went, by rail (the Red Arrow), to Leningrad, on the Krasniya Strelka. It stopped once during the night after more than 400 hundred miles. We left at 11:55 p.m. and arrived at 8:00 a.m. the next day. Interesting for a society where everyone is to be equal, how I was treated. They would not go in the dining room until I showed up, let alone order. If I were 10 minutes late, which I tried not to be, they would stand outside with Matt and Barry. In Leningrad, we had two black Volga sedans. That would be the tops, like Mercedes in Europe. One driver for each car. Matt and Barry had an interpreter, though they both get along some, and an interpreter and myself, and the driver.

Pemberton: Did you find some of your Russian coming back?

Keane: Yes, I would even hear “*sitieperjelsta*,” which was “sit down please.” Things like that, phrases of course. Still it’s nothing like living and hearing it every day. Even after 35 years, which [was] almost what it was. Our Russian counterparts took us to the Kirov Ballet. We had third row seats, first three seats in from the left aisle, and we pulled up at 7:15 for a 7:30 curtain. Two black sedans right in front. We’re not talking ambassador, we’re talking about an agency head from the United States, one of over a hundred agencies, and two colleagues, but that’s how we were treated.

I laid roses twice in Leningrad and had no problem doing that. Leningrad, as you may know, was under a 900-day siege and lost over a million people from late 1941 through early 1944. There are graves that are 100 feet one way and 150 feet the other; 400,000 people buried in one cemetery. It was a moving experience. Leningrad is not cold or dank; it has personality. Leningrad has a European flavor. These are all observations that many others have made, but they are fresh for us. What else would you like to talk about?

Pemberton: Mexico and Canada.

Keane: Mexico. The turnover there is high. Considering the dire poverty, this turnover is unsatisfactory. The first person I met, my counterpart, is now the Jim Baker of

Mexico, Dr. Pedro Aspe. He seemed to take Harvard Ph.D's and put them in charge of the INEGI (Instituto Nacional de Estadística, Geografía e Informática), which is the acronym for the statistical agency. I recall one of our conferences, when Bobbie Garcia [Representative Robert Garcia (D., New York), Chairman of the Subcommittee on Census and Population of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee] was chairing our oversight committee in the House of Representatives, and Pedro Aspe was at the same table. Pedro Aspe is one of the top five people in Mexico. Aspe, Garcia, and I signed the protocol in March 1986, I believe, with Bud Brown, at the Commerce Department. The three of us signed, not for bilateral cooperation, but for multilateral. That doesn't preclude our working with Canada, for instance, on the trade statistics as you pointed out, but we really met for all three. For instance, when Roland Moore had our people visiting the Canadian regional offices, he also had several people visiting from Mexico. All three nations were doing that. We hope to do some joint border studies with Canada and Mexico. Pete Bounpane could tell you about those studies. It's difficult. It has been a little difficult working with the Customs Service, too, because they have so much of the drug responsibility, and there is real disdain by Willie van Raab [William van Raab, Commissioner of Customs, U.S. Customs Service, 1981-1989] for the Mexicans. But van Raab has mellowed a little bit too in that regard. Customs has helped us out, as have people from Spain, on our Spanish-language training program. We are able to get them to do a guest lecture. You'd have to follow up with Bob [Bartram] to get the description. But I like the cooperation that is going on.

Pemberton: I wanted to ask you if we have had, if there was a past where we, as a Census Bureau, cooperated jointly with Mexico and Canada on projects, or would this be a "first"?

Keane: Which one? The border study? I don't know. If they could just get better funded. It would be difficult to look at the labor force of an area like Tijuana-San Diego or Juarez-El Paso, since so many of them work in each other's city. They work the other way too; people cross the boarder there. It would be difficult to get a better handle on migration. If they just had a little more money in the legalization program. A number of the key people in the statistical agency would talk to Louis [Kincannon] when he was in Mexico. Louis has an excellent understanding, excellent rapport and is able to speak Spanish. But Pete Bounpane, we pretty well covered it, just a steady stream going there, and they have a brilliant guy by the name of Dr. Carlos M. Jarque, who is on loan to the International Statistical Institute in

the Hague to help them straighten out their program. I just saw Jarque in Rome (he is a Harvard Ph.D.). He looks like he's 22, but he may be in his early 30's. He is the current head. The staff in Mexico is very able, but the turnover is high. I have been here less than 5 years and have dealt with three different people—Pedro Aspe, Rogelio Montemayor, and now Carlos Jarque.

Pemberton: **Has there been any discussion with you, by people from main Commerce or other Government agencies, concerning our efforts to create a closer relationship with the Mexican statistical agency? The reason I ask that is because from different agencies, there has been hot and cold blowing toward Mexico, and I would think if one were in Mexico, one might get a mixed signal. I was wondering if some of our officials were getting mixed signals about how we are supposed to approach Mexico.**

Keane: No major things that I am aware of. We've kept Bob Ortner abreast of what's going on. After all, Mexico is our third largest trading partner after Canada and Japan. So, with the burgeoning population and long border, it is in our interest to know what is going on, what the economy is truly like, and the quality of their figures. Problems like drug enforcement, or having an agent killed, sours the relationship real fast. In fact, we have learned quite a bit from Mexico. After the Mexico City earthquake, it took us weeks to call the INEGI office in Monterrey. Monterrey would have to relay the call and we'd have to call back. We learned from their earthquake and made some changes regarding how we store data. Mexico lost a lot of computer capacity, they lost a lot of data in that earthquake several years ago. We changed our system as a result of Mexico's loss. That's exactly what our cooperation was meant to do.

Pemberton: **That provides a good reason to go into Canada now. We also have, particularly with foreign trade, some hot and cold relations with Canada as well. We've negotiated an agreement with them, but their last election in some way turned on the public response to the free trade with the United States.**

Keane: This hasn't affected the statistical agencies at all as far as I can tell. What matters is if the free trade agreement had been turned down. That would have been [a setback] because we really geared up for that agreement. It is a positive thing. We've geared our statistical collection efforts, more or less to the prospect of that being approved. I'm talking about really four agencies, not just Statistics Canada and the Census Bureau, but Customs and Excise, Revenue Canada, and the Customs

Service here. So that's wonderful cooperation, and there are relatively few people involved.

There is probably a picture right over there, I can't get to it, that would show you a cake with a maple leaf and the flag and Ruth Hubbard [Ruth Hubbard, Deputy Minister, Customs and Excise, Revenue Canada], Ivan Fellegi [Ivan P. Fellegi, Chief Statistician of Canada], Willie Van Raab, and myself in Chuck Waite's dining room sometime last summer. If Van Raab becomes the drug czar, I don't know what. He's such a strong individual. He's been so purposeful and helpful. He likes us; we have gotten along well.

Pemberton: One of the potential drawbacks of the treaty, [in] my understanding, perhaps I'm incorrect, is that imports statistics have tended to be better than export statistics.

Keane: Consistently true. Do you know why it is true?

Pemberton: Because it's much more in your interest to know what is coming in.

Keane: It is a money trail.

Pemberton: Taxes.

Keane: Right.

Pemberton: If taxes are reduced or eliminated on the import side and if customs on both sides become less interested in the process of knowing exactly what comes into the country, it is going to make it more difficult for us. Now that we've finally begun to get some good numbers on our trade with Canada, is it going to be more difficult to get high quality numbers?

Keane: There perhaps could be some short-term difficulties; however, it seems to me that it is so important to know trade with any given country; otherwise how are you going to negotiate or get agreements? For instance, take agricultural trade with Europe—the EEC [European Economic Community] countries. You've just got to start with numbers—agreed-upon numbers. I emphasize “agreed upon” because that means quality, that means acceptable methodology, that means comparability on time, comparability on procedures, same definitions. That rigor, that's what Pear was talking about in his article in the *New York Times*. The Census Bureau is known for its rigorous methodology and methodological approach. Nations and negotiators and, whether it's the “Big Seven” [the EEC] or whoever. They've become smarter now about foreign trade numbers. So, once a month that most sensitive economic

statistic in the world comes out from this place. Ten years ago, 15 years ago, you didn't hear about that.

Pemberton: You're dealing with the demand for high quality numbers.

Keane: Well, yes. If the dissolution of trade barriers, or other changes, make our traditional ways of gathering statistics is outmoded, we will find other ways to get quality statistics because we must. We simply have to know the trade patterns of the world.

Pemberton: Are there any ongoing discussions with Canada to try to come up with alternative methods, or are we waiting until they, in fact, act on the bill?

Keane: Don Adams [Don L. Adams, Chief, Foreign Trade Division, Bureau of the Census, 1986-1993], in the Foreign Trade Division, and his counterparts are working very closely together, and have been for quite a while. There is this conference, too, that we set while I was in Canada in November. The Census Bureau will cosponsor with Canada a conference in Ottawa to provide an update on cooperation to all the invited EEC nations, Japan, Mexico, and perhaps one or two others from the Pacific rim. We will cover trade statistics, particularly exports, and focus on each others import and export numbers.

The conference is being held in Canada for a good reason. I suggested that. You know Canada. The old cliché is, "Canada is 10 percent of the US, 10 percent of the GNP, 10 percent is Canada." This is the recurring theme in the election. The US blows its horn and Canada must follow. So if you said it up there, don't even ask them where we shall hold the conference. Instead, say, "let's have it here." It is a nice thing to do, and it's a friendly gesture from the South. It shows sensitivity, and it is quickly perceived as that, too.

Ivan Fellegi is a very, very astute fellow, perhaps the best statistical agency director in the world. He's just solid all the way around. Methodologically, he is very, very strong. Fellegi is a good manager and a hard worker. He is loaded with integrity. His predecessor was Mark Wilks. But Mark hadn't spent his life at the Census Bureau—he'd spent it at AT&T and Bell Labs.

Pemberton: I hate to take you off international operations, but we're going to have to go to more domestic matters. Among the high priorities you have had is making outreaches—reaching out to a variety of groups, in the United States, to help us get better counts, better data. Among these groups have been big city mayors, gearing toward the 1990 census. Would you like to comment on how you developed your approach and how it has been implemented in regard to reaching out?

Keane: It seem to me that our approach to the mayors was a good one, but it wasn't enough, and it was at a lower level. It was the "Marshall Turners" [Marshall L. Turner, Chief, 1990 Reapportionment Staff, Bureau of the Census] and people out of our regions [i.e., regional offices] talking with counterparts well down in city administrations, rather than at the top. But the power levelers are at the top, and it's those people who can really open up and make the census. The national census is going to be good by having a whole lot of good local censuses. So, our problems are the big cities. That means go to the big city mayors and get them involved—get them to recognize they may be out of office and plan now for that possibility so that a high-level somebody is named. That's what spawned the mayor's program. They would name a person from their jurisdictions to be the Census Bureau liaisons, and the mayors would accept a call right away from any one of four people: Director, Deputy Director, Decennial Census head, regional director, even if that meant then getting the chief of police, community council, chamber of commerce, the *New York Times*, whatever. Those calls would quickly go through there, when we needed them. Bradley [Thomas Bradley, Mayor of Los Angeles, CA., 1973-1993] said, "OK, I will do it, I will name myself," and he did.

Pemberton: How many cities are now signed up?

Keane: There are 350 altogether. I got most of the big ones before the Under Secretary [Ortner] stopped me. I don't know why he stopped me. He stopped me though, I think because most of the big city mayors are Democrats, and for some reason that bothered him. The big city mayors are Republican are Voinovich [George V. Voinovich, Mayor of Cleveland, OH, 1979-1990], who got along famously with Koch [Edward L. Koch, Mayor of New York, NY, 1977-1989]; they cooperated on a number of things. Then, you drop down to Donna Owens in Toledo, or recently Charlotte, NC, but by and large it just wasn't there. Also, there was the concern because Koch pulled a "cutie" in New York when I was the chairperson, and he hosted a meeting in Gracie Mansion, which was the Census Bureau's idea. This was a plot hatched by Roland Moore. Anyway, he brought Zimroth [Peter Zimroth,

Corporation Counsel, City of New York], and Bob Rifkin [Robert S. Rifkin, Attorney with Cravath, Swaine, and Moore, the private law firm representing the City of New York in its suit against the Bureau of the Census]. Zimroth just recently had been named general counsel, so he was the top attorney for the City of New York. Rifkin had been involved in the 1980 lawsuits and was part of the Wall Street law firm of which his name is part of the partnership. Both of them had signed the recent lawsuit and tried to put me on the spot in the presence of the late Mayor Washington [Harold J. Washington, Mayor of Chicago, IL, 1983-1987], Mayor Berkley [Richard L. Berkley, Mayor of Kansas City, MO] and 25 other people, to say I would adjust the 1990 census. I wouldn't. But Mary Ann Knauss [Mary Ann T. Knauss, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Intergovernmental Affairs, Department of Commerce, 1981-1989], from downtown, was in that room. Mary Ann took that story back to the Department of Commerce. She didn't show up at the press conference that day; she wasn't invited to lunch, so she didn't know what went on there. So, she just took the story back. Then, the next day there's this photo in the *New York Times*, and it shows four of us walking down the porch. You've seen that photo. At that point I hadn't seen Mayor Coleman Young yet in Detroit. I hadn't seen Mayor Goode in Philadelphia; I hadn't seen the Boston mayor, but I had been with Mayor Kathy Whitmar in Houston, Mayor Barthelome of New Orleans, Mayor Wilson in Oakland, and the mayors of Chicago, St. Louis, New York, and Atlanta. But the photo stopped me. If you stop the Director, then you stop the program, because they were not to see others, not the top. They're not going to go to the Deputy Director. They might in 1990, but they weren't going to do it there. The word was getting in the network, "The Census Bureau is really trying to help us, it's in our self interest, cooperate." We could feel that, we just knew. Cisneros [Henry Cisneros, Mayor of Houston, TX, 1983-1987] knew. I'd seen him many times. In April 1987, we were going to have 35 or so of the largest city mayors come to San Antonio. We had agreed Cisneros would host it, and we were going to have the participants bring spouses. We figured out how it could be financed without us doing it. The mayors and I even went so far as to sing the tune "We Are The World, We Are The Census." Then each one of the mayors could step up before the group and do a little one for his market. Pay us \$5,000 and we would produce the song and send it back to Los Angeles or San Diego. That is how far along we were, but that was stopped, too, by downtown.

Pemberton: That was essentially put on hold; when was this?

Keane: That was late July or early August of 1986. You can see what lead time I had. I had met with 14 mayors myself, some of them of not-so-big cities, but they were the 14. You take [14 or]15 cities here and what proportion they have of the undercount, and it's enormous.

Pemberton: Were the next director to come to you and ask for advice, would you suggest this particular program, making an effort to reach out to mayors where many of the undercount problems are? Would you be willing to do that?

Keane: Yes.

Pemberton: There are, of course, other groups that are terribly interested in a variety of census numbers. One is the state legislatures, having to do with redrawing of their districts after the census. Have you had many dealings with state legislatures?

Keane: A few; I talked with the Midwest State Legislators Conference, Lake of the Ozarks. There were 12 states represented there. Occasionally, like in Alaska, I will get involved with one or two. But Marshall Turner does such a good job, as does Pete Bounpane. There's just no sense getting in the middle of that when the process already runs smoothly. They understand the importance; it moves along well. Marshall is so knowledgeable, so well accepted and known. I just can't imagine stepping on his lines.

Pemberton: How about Governors?

Keane: They are like the mayors, you pay hell seeing a Governor. Governor Dukakis [Massachusetts] did us a real favor. He introduced me to eight or nine governors at the 1986 or 1987 Governors' Conference here. I've seen them; they are pretty hard to see. After all they're like a Senator, only there are only half as many. It's tough to see a Governor.

Pemberton: So in a sense there was not a concerted effort or was there a concerted effort. . . ?

Keane: No, but there was a good reason why. Take New York, take any state, the difference there, you've got teeming New York City with all its problems, and you've got Rome, New York, with an air base and no problems and everything in between there. Go where the problems are; put in an inordinate amount of time, attention, and resources where the undercount is. That is why we do things with the U.S.

Conference of Catholic Bishops on Hispanics. That's why we just started a program that came out of the Behavioral Research Group. The suggestion was made by a competent state college guy who is doing contract work for us, that there are approximately 1 million Black males on parole. Go to the parole officers. No one had ever heard of that suggestion until this guy made it. We can and should focus our attention on the million people out there who really are pretty close to the profile of the hard to enumerate. We've just got to go after them. That was behind the mayors' thing, or the Congress of National Black Churches.

We try for everybody, talk about big numbers, and really reduce the undercount. The ball game is with Hispanics, especially undocumented, and young Black males. Get those two groups and do the usual varsity job on the rest, and we've got ourselves a whiz bang census in 1990.

Pemberton: That leads us right to minority groups. What role have you had in singling out the groups that we have tried to approach to get their cooperation? You mentioned the National Conference of Catholic Bishops. From your talks here and elsewhere you have been willing to speak to those groups and are willing to listen to them.

Keane: You bet. Not just speak, but also work with them. On August 1, I was the Federal resources luncheon speaker at the National Urban League. That talk is being published now, along with one I gave before the U.S. Hispanic Chamber of Commerce about 6 weeks after that. We talked twice to the National Congress of American Indians. I can remember when we met with the Census Bureau. The Director came in for the first session or so, made comments, talked, and left right then. He didn't wait for the coffee break; you'd never see the Director of the Census Bureau again. This was not lost on them. They've commented on that over and over again. Our standing committees get that criticism, too. It is a little easier with it consolidated like this, but that just wasn't the pattern before. You were involved with it weren't you, Fred?

Bohme: [Frederick G. Bohme, Chief, History Branch, Bureau of the Census, 1975-1993 sat-in as an observer]. I was around in 1975 when Vince Barabba was organizing the first committees.

Keane: Vince would come in, but then he'd go.

Bohme: That's true, but I will say this—when the chips were down, he was there. He would tell the committees how it was going to be, and they would realize he was talking with them one-to-one.

Keane: He was good at that, excellent.

Pemberton: We are nearly done; I think we should wrap it up, I have stayed away from asking you questions about certain things that are currently in litigation or might be somewhat controversial. Would it be conceivable on the return trip to Washington to ask you to complete an interview to ask you some more questions?

Keane: Sure. I don't know when I'll be able to talk about the adjustment issue. Maybe a long time, depending; what else is there?

Pemberton: One thing—the budget process, how it works.

Keane: Not very well.

Pemberton: How do we develop it and then how it is shepherded, or not shepherded, through the process and finally to Congress? Your perspective on how that happens, I think would be of interest. Possibly some questions. The GAO [General Account Office] wrote a somewhat critical report on our acquiring our main computer systems for the 1990 Census of Population and Housing and the 1987 Economic Censuses and for survey work. They raised a number of questions or concerns which I suspect there are answers to, but there was not a formal request in that report for a Census Bureau response. They criticized us for delaying the decisions on the 1990 census, which in turn had implications for the procurement process. I was going to ask you, and I think you addressed this early on, part of the problem with the delays was the fact that we were trying to get somebody appointed Associate Director for the Decennial Census to make decisions.

Keane: Sure, it's like that delay to fill the Census Promotion Office [CPO] head; there was criticism for being so far behind in our planning for that. They didn't want us to get a consultant. We were going to hire Harold Webber, who handled that job in the 1980 census. For him to formulate the specifications and to send us some top candidates, it was going to cost \$50,000. The Census Bureau didn't want to spend \$50,000. They just couldn't delay, they wanted to see resumes, and they wanted to see the candidates; then in the end, they didn't do that, but they held us up for months. Secretary Baldrige's death in July 1987 changed some things. B. Jay

Cooper [B. Jay Cooper, Director, Office of Public Affairs, Department of Commerce, 1984-1987], had been involved in that; it is the red tape and the delay.